

**ACADEMIC BOARD REVIEW
PHASE TWO**

**FACULTY OF HEALTH SCIENCES
28 OCTOBER 2003**

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONTENTS

1. MEMBERSHIP	2
1.1 REVIEW TEAM	2
1.2 SENIOR FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES	2
1.3 STAFF	2
1.4 STUDENTS.....	2
2. INTRODUCTION.....	2
3. QUALITY ASSURANCE.....	3
3.2 SELF-EVALUATION REPORT.....	3
3.3 FOLLOW-UP TO PHASE ONE REVIEW	3
3.4 BENCHMARKING	4
4. GOAL ONE: QUALITY TEACHING AND LEARNING.....	4
4.1 UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE REFORM	4
4.2 THE CLINICAL EXPERIENCE	5
4.3 RESEARCH LED TEACHING.....	5
4.4 FLEXIBLE ONLINE LEARNING	5
4.5 EVALUATION.....	5
5. GOAL TWO: DIVERSITY, ACCESS AND EQUITY.....	6
5.2 THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE	6
5.3 YOOROANG GARANG.....	6
5.4 MEDICAL AND DISABILITY SERVICES	7
6. GOAL THREE: EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH.....	7
6.1 RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY.....	7
6.2 RESEARCH CENTRES	7
6.3 LINKAGE GRANTS.....	8
6.4 RESEARCH SUPERVISION.....	8
6.5 COMMUNITY OF SCHOLARS	8
7. GOAL FOUR: INTERNATIONALISATION.....	8
7.1 OVERSEAS LINKS	8
7.2 INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS	9
7.3 STUDENT PROGRESS RATES	9
8. GOAL FIVE: ENGAGEMENT WITH INDUSTRY AND THE PROFESSIONS.....	9
9. GOAL 6: EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT	10
9.1 FACULTY LEADERSHIP	10
9.2 FLEXSIS IMPLEMENTATION AND STUDENT ADMINISTRATION.....	10
10. GOAL SEVEN: SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY	10
11. CONCLUSIONS	11
11.1 COMMENDATIONS.....	11
11.2 RECOMMENDATIONS	12
APPENDIX ONE: FOLLOW UP ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PHASE ONE	14

Note: *This report draws on the information provided in the documentation considered by the Review Team as well as discussion with staff and students. In some places, material from the Self-Evaluation Report has been incorporated directly into the text.*

1. MEMBERSHIP

1.1 Review Team

Professor Judyth Sachs (<i>Chair</i>)	Chair of the Academic Board
Professor Tim Hirst	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation)
Professor Doug Elliott	Faculty of Nursing
Associate Professor Scott Kable	Faculty of Science

Review Team Secretary

Ms Barb McLean	Executive Officer (Quality Assurance)
----------------	---------------------------------------

1.2 Senior Faculty representatives

1.2.1 The Review Team met the following Senior Faculty representatives during the first interview:

Professor Hal Kendig	Dean
Dr Alastair Davison	Pro-Dean
Ms Lynne Adamson	Associate Dean – Clinical Education
Associate Professor Chris Maher	Associate Dean – Graduate Research
Associate Professor Nick O’Dwyer	Associate Dean – Research
Dr Peter Knight	Associate Dean – Students
Dr Ann Poulos	Associate Dean – Teaching and Learning
Dr Steve Cummings	Associate Dean – Undergraduate Studies
Mr Brett Andrews	Faculty Manager
Mr Sam Aquilina	Faculty Accountant
Ms Jennifer Cox	Head of Medical Radiation Sciences
	Chair Marketing Reference Group

1.3 Staff

1.3.1 The Review Team met with nine members of Academic and General Staff.

1.4 Students

1.4.1 The Review Team met three groups of students: eight undergraduate students; seven postgraduate research students; and three postgraduate coursework students. Yooroang Garang students were attending campus for block release and were able to participate in the Review.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 The Phase Two review complements the Phase One review, following up its recommendations and considering each Faculty’s activities and quality assurance arrangements in relation to the seven goals of the University’s Strategic Plan.

2.2 The Faculty of Health Sciences’ Self-Evaluation Report for the Phase Two review reports the successful amalgamation of the Faculty into the University. The majority of Faculty leadership positions have been filled with staff appointed since the amalgamation. The

appointment by the University of a new College Pro Vice-Chancellor has assisted the perception of a new era for the Faculty. Further evidence is the participation rate of Faculty staff in College planning activities and the chairing of College committees. Strategic directions for the Faculty are being developed as part of the College of Health Sciences (CHS) planning process. The 2005 implementation of the FlexSIS Student Information System will complete the amalgamation process.

- 2.3 Amalgamation of the Faculty within the University at the macro level is mirrored by the need to integrate the Faculty's ten schools at the Faculty level. The schools operate quite independently in a business sense with annual budgets allocated by the Dean after consultation and they also take full responsibility for the management of their academic programs. While the size of these schools vary considerably, there are no plans regarding reducing the number of schools.
- 2.4 The Dean's approach of using senior appointments as a means of strengthening a Faculty approach in academic matters was endorsed by the Review Team; in particular the appointment of seven Associate Deans in the areas of Clinical Education, Graduate Coursework, Graduate Research, Research, Students, Teaching and Learning, and Undergraduate Studies. These positions have been appointed to chair Faculty Committees and as a response to student feedback.

3. QUALITY ASSURANCE

- 3.1 The Faculty's Self-Evaluation Report mentions a number of reviews and processes of self-analysis the Faculty has undertaken and demonstrates a strong quality assurance culture in terms of structures and processes of Faculty activity. The Review Team commends the Faculty on the embedding of a quality approach in all facets of Faculty life. (*See Commendation One*)

3.2 Self-Evaluation Report

- 3.2.1 The Pro-Dean led a collaborative knowledge management exercise to compile an informative Self-Evaluation Report on behalf of the Faculty. While the Heads of Schools and the Associate Deans provided input, it was reported that the process did identify the difficulty of gathering information about Faculty operations. The Review Team commends the proposal to provide a template for data collection at the school level which would be centrally maintained by the Faculty. This would provide a resource for Management Information at the Faculty level and remove the need for ad hoc requests to the schools for information. (*See Commendation Two*)

3.3 Follow-up to Phase One Review

- 3.3.1 As mentioned above, full integration of the Faculty into the broader University community will come with integration at the level of major administrative systems. The implementation of FlexSIS in 2005 will bring common business rules around student administration and a common University Student Identification Card. Until this occurs the Faculty is limited in its offering joint degrees or access to Camperdown/Darlington Units of Study by the necessity for double enrolment. This has constrained opportunities for student integration into the broader University community.
- 3.3.2 The Self-Evaluation Report mentions initiatives such as the Inter-Professional Learning Initiative and the 2004 joint degree with Exercise and Sports Sciences and Science, as the commencement of greater integration. The Review Team commends the discussion around the development of College-wide interdisciplinary Units of Study (such as Indigenous Health

Issues) and recommends that the discussion commenced at the 2003 CHS retreat be pursued at the College level. (*See Recommendation One*)

- 3.3.3 The Review Team commends the Faculty for the involvement of the student body in its governance bodies, particularly the Teaching and Learning Committee, Graduate Studies Committee, Faculty Research Committee and school assessment program meetings. The use of this medium presents the opportunity for a communication mechanism between staff and students and a student voice into the school and Faculty planning process. (*See Commendation Three*)
- 3.3.4 The Review Team commends the Faculty on its successful TIF Grant to research best practice in grade descriptors and the use of WebCT as a mechanism of providing feedback. This grant is already having a positive impact on Faculty practices through complementary research and process improvement. Research by the School of Applied Vision Sciences has determined that students define feedback on student work to be written (on the bottom of assignments) and individual; other forms of staff feedback (e.g. group feedback on noticeboards) are not recognised as such by students. Staff are adopting the practice of being explicit about feedback; a definition of feedback is included in the *Student Manual*. (*See Commendation Four*)
- 3.3.5 The Review Team commends the work undertaken to date to establish a student nominated Excellence in Teaching Award and looks forward to its commencement in 2004. (*See Commendation Five*)

3.4 Benchmarking

- 3.4.1 The Self-Evaluation Report documents the difficulties faced by the Faculty in benchmarking both in the teaching and research areas due to differences in discipline and curriculum between potential Go6 benchmarking partners. Internationally the Faculty, through its schools, has some informal benchmarking activity with New Zealand (accreditation means that the courses are similar). The Review Team recommends that the Faculty identify appropriate international benchmarking partners as well as investigating the benchmarking of common activities and processes within the College of Health Sciences. The Review Team also recommends that the Faculty liaise with ITL over perceived problems in SCEQ data quality. (*Recommendation Two*)

4. GOAL ONE: QUALITY TEACHING AND LEARNING

4.1 Undergraduate and Graduate Reform

- 4.1.1 In 2000 the Faculty started a major review of undergraduate teaching across the Faculty as part of a process known as *Undergraduate Reform*. As a result, the structure and operation of many cross-disciplinary units were extensively changed to achieve greater efficiencies and better meet the needs of students. The Project placed emphasis on Inquiry-Based Teaching and was facilitated by a TIF Grant.
- 4.1.2 The Faculty plans to review its 178 postgraduate coursework offerings in 2004. Some of these have small enrolments with evidence of significant overlap in some Units of Study. Preliminary work undertaken in 2002 suggested that a smaller number of broader, more flexible programs would better suit the Faculty needs and achieve greater efficiency. *Graduate Reform* will be aligned with a College-wide approach to the implementation of business cases for coursework offerings (including funding, enrolments modelling, time to replace seed funding, etc.). A rationalisation of postgraduate coursework offerings will also lighten workloads and increase the time available for staff to undertake research. The Review Team commends the Faculty on its plan to undertake *Graduate Reform* and its involvement in

a College-wide approach to the review of postgraduate coursework offerings. (*See Commendation Six*)

4.2 The Clinical Experience

4.2.1 Like other practice-based disciplines across the University, the Faculty reported instances where clinical practice and teaching failed to align and students reported instances when clinicians discounted research-led teaching. In an attempt to overcome the pervasive sense that “practice counts”, the Faculty uses the position of the Clinical Academic to interview and assess clinical staff; provide clinicians with manuals and workshops; and teleconference with remote clinicians. The Faculty also uses joint positions (clinical/academic). The Faculty is applying for a Linkage Grant to manage clinical practice.

4.2.2 The Inter-professional Learning Initiative provides an indication of how the clinical experience can be organised to reflect best practice and be perceived as credible by hospital staff. This project was undertaken jointly with the Northern Clinical School and piloted multidisciplinary clinical placements. In addition to students being drawn from three discipline areas, their access to staff in the hospitals was multidisciplinary. Students had weekly mini case meetings and presented their interdisciplinary case reports at the end of the placement. While this experiment was resource intensive, both students and hospital staff provided positive evaluations to the project advisory team. The Review Team commends the Faculty for its innovative pilot of an interdisciplinary approach to clinical experience. (*See Commendation Seven*)

4.3 Research led Teaching

4.3.1 Undergraduate and postgraduate coursework students were all conscious that teaching they received was evidence based and reported that assignments are required to be based on current research. Students commented that while they were aware of research being undertaken by their lecturers and in their school, they were not aware of research being undertaken across the Faculty.

4.4 Flexible Online Learning

4.4.1 The Faculty has appointed an Education Connections Director at the level of Senior Lecturer to be responsible for training and quality assurance as Faculty usage of WebCT increases and becomes more sophisticated. Faculty usage of WebCT ranges across DEST’s Mode A, B and C in both undergraduate and postgraduate courses. Several schools are also trialling the use of WebCT to support clinical practice, especially during fieldwork when students are off campus. WebCT also facilitates communication between staff and students and overcomes issues such as the capacity of Hotmail accounts.

4.4.2 The Self-Evaluation Report mentions that IT and AV facilities in teaching venues has not kept pace with the rate of integration of WebCT into Faculty programs. The Review Team recommends that the Faculty continue to work with the College for a University standard for teaching venue facilities, resources and support. (*See Recommendation Three*)

4.5 Evaluation

4.5.1 The Faculty is addressing Phase One concerns about consistency of feedback (see Section 3.2.5) in the pedagogical sense, but students reported issues regarding student evaluation and feedback. Students reported a session at the end of the year dedicated to student evaluation, but they were not aware of any Faculty response. They also reported that half the students do not fill in evaluation forms because they believe nothing changes as a result of their feedback. Concurrently with their assumptions about staff responsiveness, students reported their own

disengagement. Part-time students reported a lack of interest in the findings of both evaluation and feedback.

5. GOAL TWO: DIVERSITY, ACCESS AND EQUITY

5.1 The Faculty of Health Sciences has attracted a diverse student body; as a consequence the focus of the Faculty response to this Goal area is on providing the necessary services to appropriately support its diverse student population and provide them with a high quality educational experience and environment. The Review Team commends the Faculty on its Student Progress Ratios for students in diversity categories. (*See Commendation Eight*)

5.2 The Student Experience

5.2.1 A common theme reported by both students and staff was both the isolation of the Lidcombe campus and its lack of student facilities and life outside lectures. When it rained students reported that there was nowhere to go outside the classroom. Social events could not be programmed for evenings due to the lack of public transport, concerns about safety and the mixing of alcohol and driving. The Review Team felt that the lack of student services and facilities was an equity issue; especially the lack of an equivalent service to the Security Bus on the Camperdown/Darlington Campus. The Review Team recommends that the Dean and the executive of the Guild take up the issue of the Security Bus with the Director of the Staff and Student Equal Opportunity Unit. (*See Recommendation Four*)

5.2.2 The Review Team commends the Cumberland Student Guild for consistently scheduling events and attempting to positively affect the student experience at the Cumberland campus. (*See Commendation Nine*)

5.3 Yooroang Garang

5.3.1 Yooroang Garang students reported concerns with the title of their course. Bachelor of Health Science (Aboriginal Health & Community Development) is disenfranchising for Torres Strait Islanders. The Review Team recommends that the Faculty replace the phrase "Aboriginal Health" with "Australian Indigenous Health" (*See Recommendation Five*)

5.3.2 Student Welfare Services offers a Student Preparation Program (SPP) for Faculty International students. In addition to compulsory classes in Life Skills, English Language Skills, and Academic Learning Skills, Student Welfare Services provides practical assistance, such as meeting students at the airport and assisting them in travelling to the campus for the first time. Yooroang Garang students, many of whom come from remote communities, would welcome a similar service. In addition, students travelling from the same airport were placed on different flights, instead of travelling as a group. Students also reported that links to local indigenous groups and traditional welcoming ceremonies were not provided. There is no mechanism provided by School, the Faculty or the Guild to integrate Yooroang Garang students with other students on campus. The Review Team recommends that Yooroang Garang introduce a culturally appropriate Student Preparation Program based on the SPP for International Students. (*See Recommendation Six*)

5.3.3 Students reported on the intensive nature of the block release form of study and the requirement to undertake assessment in the form of exams on the last day of the block. In addition to feeling they were not performing their best, students then had to wait for 8 weeks for assessment feedback. The Review Team recommend that Yooroang Garang investigate alternative forms of assessment for exams during block release learning. (*See Recommendation Seven*)

5.4 Medical and Disability Services

- 5.4.1 Students are required to meet vaccination standards and health checks. The University meets the vaccination requirements but not the broader health check. This is increasing as an issue due to the decreasing number of General Practitioners bulk billing, and the lack of parity with UTS which provides health checks for their students.
- 5.4.2 Students reported some administrative problems with Disability Services in the area of exam scheduling and supervision for students given extra time.

6. GOAL THREE: EXCELLENCE IN RESEARCH

6.1 Research Productivity

- 6.1.1 The Faculty is maturing in its research culture – moving from a focus on participation in research to a focus on research productivity. This change is reflected in the strategies of the 2003 Faculty Research Plan.
- 6.1.2 In order to plan this next phase of its research development that Faculty has undertaken a Research Review, chaired by a colleague from another faculty in the College. The Review aims to identify actions that will ensure that the Faculty's research productivity, in terms of the University measures of research performance, moves ahead each year to reach equivalency to the rest of the University within 5 years.
- 6.1.3 The Review Team recommends that the Faculty support and resource the recommendations of the Research Review. (*See Recommendation Eight*)
- 6.1.4 To further assist the development of research productivity the Dean has made the strategic senior appointment of a Director of Research and Development. This position is charged with assisting staff with applications, fostering collaboration between inexperienced and experienced researchers, providing advice on career development in the area of research, and increasing the Faculty's success with NHMRC and other large grant schemes.
- 6.1.5 The Review Team commends the Faculty on its strategic approach to developing research productivity across the Faculty; particularly the undertaking of a Research Review and the appointment of a Director of Research and Development. (*See Commendation Ten*)
- 6.1.6 Schools are in the processes of implementing a new formula on which academic workload is calculated in order to reward staff for expanding their research participation and productivity. There may be opportunities to access College funding to support this change. The Faculty could also investigate the limiting of workload on a competitive basis in order to reinforce the change in priorities. The Review Team recommends that the Faculty liaise with the Faculty of Science regarding its work on the development of a non-linear workload formula. (*See Recommendation Nine*)

6.2 Research Centres

- 6.2.1 In 2002/2003 the Faculty reviewed its three Research Centres with relation to their fit with Faculty strategic directions, optimal productivity and the research-teaching nexus. As a result the National Voice Centre has been transferred to the Conservatorium of Music and the Australian Stuttering Research Centre and the Rehabilitation Research Centre have been moved into appropriate schools. The review sends a message that research is not undertaken in isolation, but is rather a part of ongoing academic activities.

6.3 Linkage Grants

- 6.3.1 Given the close links between the Faculty and its professions, through accreditation and professional practice, the Review Team were surprised with the low success rate of the Faculty in the area of Linkage Grants. The Review Team recommends that the Faculty develop measures to support staff in the necessary preparatory work to identifying and negotiating the participation of appropriate research partners and teams. (*See Recommendation Ten*)

6.4 Research Supervision

- 6.4.1 Students reported no problems with research supervision. The Faculty has in place formalised processes to ensure access to supervisors with appropriate qualifications and expertise, processes to ensure students are guided and mentored in their research, and processes to ensure student progress. The processes have been formalised due to the high proportion of part time postgraduate research students.

6.5 Community of Scholars

- 6.5.1 The Faculty has undertaken multiple approaches to improve the postgraduate research student experience. The Self-Evaluation Report lists Faculty Induction evenings, an 'all postgraduate student email list', policy development (e.g. Resource Statement, Guidelines on Supervisor Qualifications), research seminars, and cross school social events. Postgraduate students reported positively on access to facilities; including office space, the Stats Lab, computers and opportunities for teaching. They also felt supported and mentored by their supervisors.
- 6.5.2 Despite this initiative students still expressed a sense of isolation. Across the Faculty postgraduate students are predominantly part-time (at 31/3/03 the Faculty had 848 part-time and 292 full-time postgraduate students) and focussed on their school/discipline area rather than the Faculty. There is no social focus, as provided by SUPRA on the Camperdown/Darlington Campus. Students were not aware of the positions or roles of the Associate Deans for Research and Graduate Research, or the Director of Research and Development.
- 6.5.2 The Review Team recommend that the Faculty investigate ways of developing a Faculty-wide sense of a community of scholars as a means of reducing the isolation of postgraduate students. (*See Recommendation Eleven*)

7. GOAL FOUR: INTERNATIONALISATION

7.1 Overseas Links

- 7.1.1 The Faculty has long established fieldwork and teaching links with Singapore and the Indian sub continent. Quality is assured with the Singapore Institute of Management (SIM) course by evaluation by both partner institutions and the accrediting professional body.
- 7.1.2 The Faculty is working to convert its existing gerontology program into a University wide Study Age On-Line program, available world wide, with the possible international collaboration of University of British Columbia (UBC).
- 7.1.3 The Faculty has little activity in the area of formal Study Abroad programs, due to the close alignment of Faculty courses with local accreditation requirements. Negotiations are currently underway with UBC to formalise opportunities for Postgraduate Coursework exchange. In addition, the move to market the Bachelor of Health Sciences program as a generic graduate entry program may assist the development of Study Abroad opportunities.

7.2 International Students

7.2.1 International student recruitment is not undertaken by the Faculty directly, but rather through the College and the schools. In spite of this, the Faculty has consistently had a higher proportion of international undergraduate students than the University average; while the number of international research students has grown above the University average. However postgraduate coursework numbers have been static for the last 3 years. The Review Team recommends that the Marketing Reference Group liaise with the College International and Development Manager to gather data on the determining factors in the selection of Health Sciences tertiary education providers, and to build a marketing campaign on the basis of this data. (*See Recommendation Twelve*)

7.3 Student Progress Rates

7.3.1 The Faculty achieves equivalent progress rates between its local and international cohorts. There is no data available to attribute this success definitively, but the innovative Student Preparation Program must play a role, along with schools monitoring the level of the IELTS entry requirements. The Review Team commends the Faculty for student progress rates amongst International students. (*See Commendation Eleven*)

7.3.2 The Language Learning Unit (LLU) provides concurrent Learning Assistance and English Language Skills tuition free to all students enrolled on Cumberland campus. However students did report reluctance by International students to speak in tutorials and to participate in group assessments and tasks.

8. GOAL FIVE: ENGAGEMENT WITH INDUSTRY AND THE PROFESSIONS

8.1 Both the Self-Evaluation Report and interviews with staff confirm a high level of engagement by the Faculty with its related industry and professions. Engagement with the professions commences with the formalised process of course accreditation, but moves beyond this to joint research projects and continuing professional development activities. The Self-Evaluation Report also documents engagement with government in the form of successful grants and projects. Opportunities for communication with government have recently been improved by the State Government appointment of Principal Advisor on Allied Health.

8.2 In the area of continuing professional development the Faculty is aligning itself with the College direction towards fully articulated programs. The Senior Lecturer in Educational Connections is leading this initiative at the Faculty level. The Faculty's professional-entry Master's degrees have become a way for graduates to upgrade their qualifications and for graduates from other fields to enter the allied health professions.

8.3 The new Graduate Program in Sexual Health commencing in 2004 is an indication of the Faculty direction in its coursework offerings. The course has been developed, and will be presented by a multi-disciplinary team of sexual health practitioners. ASSERT (Australian Society for Sexuality Educators, Researchers and Therapists) and ACSHP (Australasian College of Sexual Health Physicians) have worked with the Faculty to develop the program, and will have an active role in course delivery. The program uses a Blended E-Learning mode, with many Units of Study delivered on the WebCT delivery platform. The Review Team commends the Faculty for the business-like approach and engagement with the professions in the development of the Graduate Program in Sexual Health. (*See Commendation Twelve*)

8.4 The Faculty was involved in the tender for the establishment of an International Centre of Excellence in Sport Science and Administration (ICESSA). With the Faculty, partners in this

venture include the UTS and Sydney Olympic Park Authority. This Centre is giving the Faculty an international presence and is attracting high profile visitors. The Review Team commends the Faculty on its participation in efforts to establish the International Centre of Excellence in Sport Science and Administration. (*See Commendation Thirteen*)

- 8.5 Where there is a one-to-one relationship between a school, a course and a professional group in the Allied Health area the Faculty is successful in its engagement with the professions. However problems were reported where engagement with the profession is required with multiple University partners and the profession, e.g. Psychology, which has links to the Faculties of Science and Health Sciences.

9. GOAL 6: EFFECTIVE MANAGEMENT

9.1 Faculty Leadership

- 9.1.1 In 2000 the Faculty carried out a major review of its governance structures with the aim of optimally aligning its structures with those of the University. As mentioned in Section 2.4 the number of Associate Deans was increased to align Faculty committees with those of the University, and as a response to strategic issues.

- 9.1.2 The Review Team recommends that the Faculty continues to strengthen its senior academic staff, including the appointment of additional professors. (*See Recommendation Thirteen*)

9.2 FlexSIS implementation and Student Administration

- 9.2.1 As indicated earlier the implementation of the FlexSIS Student Information System will not only mark the full amalgamation of the Faculty into the University (see Section 2.2) but will also improve customer service to students. Currently documentation is going missing between two standalone computer systems, and usage of WebCT requires additional work to authorise students from the Faculty of Health Sciences. Counter staff frustration is resulting in poor customer service to students.

- 9.2.2 The Review Team commends the Faculty for its willingness to work to identify academic requirements for FlexSIS (such as partial credit transfer) and willingness to change current business practices in order to fully exploit the facilities of FlexSIS 6.5. (*See Commendation Fourteen*)

- 9.2.3 The service orientation of Student Administration is not uniform or pro-active. Students reported instances when documentation was not processed due to it being incomplete, but this was not conveyed to the student. The Faculty of Science customer training model could be used as a strategy to make this area more service focussed.

10. GOAL SEVEN: SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY

- 10.1 The Faculty contributes to the intellectual capital of the community by organising community forums and short courses and by providing media access to its experts.

- 10.2 The Faculty provides expert services to the community through its clinics, e.g. the Driver Rehabilitation Clinic; through programs such as HIPFIT, a post-fracture treatment package to aid the recovery of elderly patients, and the Lidcombe Program, a behavioural treatment for child stutterers.

11. CONCLUSIONS

11.1 Commendations

Quality Assurance

1. The Review Team commends the Faculty on the embedding of a quality approach in all facets of Faculty life. (See Section 3.1)
2. The Review Team commends the proposal to provide a template for data collection at the school level which would be centrally maintained by the Faculty. This would provide a resource for Management Information at the Faculty level and remove the need for ad hoc requests to the schools for information. (See Section 3.2.1)
3. The Review Team commends the Faculty for the involvement of the student body in its governance structures and processes, particularly the Teaching and Learning Committee, Graduate Studies Committee, Faculty Research Committee and school assessment program meetings. (See Section 3.3.3)
4. The Review Team commends the Faculty on its successful TIF Grant to research best practice in grade descriptors and the use of WebCT as a mechanism of providing feedback. (See Section 3.3.4)
5. The Review Team commends the work undertaken to date to establish a student nominated Excellence in Teaching Award and looks forward to its commencement in 2004. (See Section 3.3.5)

Goal One: Quality Teaching and Learning

6. The Review Team commends the Faculty on its plan to undertake *Graduate Reform* and its involvement in a College-wide approach to the review of postgraduate coursework offerings. (See Section 4.1.2)
7. The Review Team commends the Faculty for its Inter-Professional Learning Initiative – an innovative pilot of an interdisciplinary approach to clinical experience. (See Section 4.2.2)

Goal Two: Diversity, Access and Equity

8. The Review Team commends the Faculty on its Student Progress Ratios for students in diversity categories. (See Section 5.1)
9. The Review Team commends the Cumberland Student Guild for consistently scheduling events and attempting to positively affect the student experience at the Lidcombe campus. (See Section 5.2.2)

Goal Three: Excellence in Research

10. The Review Team commends the Faculty on its strategic approach to developing research productivity across the Faculty; particularly the undertaking of a Research Review and the appointment of a Director of Research and Development. (See Section 6.1.5)

Goal Four: Internationalisation

11. The Review Team commends the Faculty for student progress rates of international students. *(See Section 7.3.1)*

Goal Five: Engagement with Industry and the Professions

12. The Review Team commends the Faculty for the business-like approach and engagement with the professions in the development of the Graduate Program in Sexual Health. *(See Section 8.3)*
13. The Review Team commends the Faculty on its participation in efforts to establish the International Centre of Excellence in Sport Science and Administration. *(See Section 8.4)*

Goal Six: Effective Management

14. The Review Team commends the Faculty for its willingness to work to identify academic requirements for FlexSIS (such as partial credit transfer) and willingness to change current business practices in order to fully exploit the facilities of FlexSIS 6.5. *(See Section 9.2.2)*

11.2 Recommendations

Quality Assurance

1. The Review Team commends the discussion around the development of College-wide interdisciplinary Units of Study (such as Indigenous Health Issues) and recommends that the discussion commenced at the 2003 CHS retreat be pursued at the College level. *(See Section 3.3.2)*
2. The Review Team recommends that the Faculty identify appropriate international benchmarking partners as well as investigating the benchmarking of common activities and processes within the College of Health Sciences. The Review Team also recommends that the Faculty liaise with ITL over perceived problems in SCEQ data quality. *(See Section 3.4.1)*

Goal One: Quality Teaching and Learning

3. The Review Team recommends that the Faculty continue to work with the College for a University standard for teaching venue facilities, resources and support. *(See Section 4.4.2)*

Goal Two: Diversity, Access and Equity

4. The Review Team recommends that the Dean and the executive of the Guild take up the issue of the Security Bus with the Director of the Staff and Student Equal Opportunity Unit. *(See Section 5.2.1)*
5. The Review Team recommends that the Faculty replace the phrase “Aboriginal Health” with “Australian Indigenous Health” in its Bachelor of Health Science. *(See Section 5.3.1)*
6. The Review Team recommends that Yooroang Garang introduce a culturally appropriate Student Preparation Program based on the SPP for International Students. *(See Section 5.3.2)*
7. The Review Team recommend that Yooroang Garang investigate alternative forms of assessment for exams during block release learning. *(See Section 5.3.3)*

Goal Three: Excellence in Research

8. The Review Team recommends that the Faculty support and resource the recommendations of the Research Review. (*See Section 6.1.3*)
9. The Review Team recommends that the Faculty liaise with the Faculty of Science regarding its work on the development of a non-linear workload formula. (*See Section 6.1.6*)
10. The Review Team recommends that the Faculty develop measures to support staff in the necessary preparatory work to identifying and negotiating the participation of appropriate research partners and teams. (*See Section 6.3.1*)
11. The Review Team recommend that the Faculty investigate ways of developing a Faculty-wide sense of a community of scholars as a means of reducing the isolation of postgraduate students. (*See Section 6.5.2*)

Goal Four: Internationalisation

12. The Review Team recommends that the Marketing Reference Group liaise with the College International and Development Manager to gather data on the determining factors in the selection of Health Sciences tertiary education providers, and to build a marketing campaign on the basis of this data. (*See Section 7.2.1*)

Goal Six: Effective Management

13. The Review Team recommends that the Faculty continues to strengthen its senior academic staff, including the appointment of additional professors. (*See Section 9.1.2*)

Professor Judyth Sachs
Chair, Review Team

November 10, 2003

APPENDIX ONE: FOLLOW UP ON RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PHASE ONE

FOLLOW-UP TO PHASE 1 REVIEW

Prior to the compiling of this section of the report, comments were sought from Associate Deans and HOS, so that the range of actions triggered by the Academic Board Review Phase 1 (ABR1) recommendations can be appreciated. It was felt this was important as the diversity of disciplines leads to varied responses.

Recommendation 1	The Review Team recommends that the Faculty investigate ways to promote stronger staff and student integration into the broader University community.
Action taken by the Faculty	<p>Whilst the spirit of this recommendation is accepted it is not seen by students as a significant academic issue as evidenced by established feedback mechanisms. There are comments about access to sports and club facilities and activities which are largely absent on the Cumberland campus, and the level of Guild fees that students are still required to pay. Institutional and distance factors prevail here. The item below re. Flexsis is relevant.</p> <p>The adoption centrally of a <i>‘Whole of University’</i> culture would greatly assist. We are often forgotten and have to ask to be included in University initiatives that are planned without due consideration of the multi-campus nature of the University of Sydney.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students and staff are jointly involved in career days to promote the Faculty and courses across the university. • Multi-disciplinary Interest in Rural and General Health Education (MIRAGE) is a group that runs across the university and has students from all faculties in it. Efforts are being made to inform students. • Joint degree between ESS and Science to commence in 2004. • Involvement in a clinical education project, the “Inter-professional Learning Initiative”, in conjunction with Northern Clinical School. The aim is to promote learning activities in a multidisciplinary student team and to increase exposure to broader university learning environments.
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of Flexsis has started and FHS will go live in 2005. This will allow greater flexibility of enrolments. Currently joint degrees or UOS sharing requires parallel enrolment • Flexsis implementation will allow the issue of a standard student ID card. The FHS card is not accepted on Camperdown without special arrangement, inhibiting students accessing many University facilities. • At the 2003 CHS retreat, the prospect of students from many disciplines sharing a joint UOS was discussed. An example of Indigenous Health Issues which could involve medicine, dentistry, nursing, pharmacy and the FHS disciplines was considered. This action is still being considered and could be an enhancement of the “Inter-professional Learning Initiative” mentioned above.
Faculty’s evaluation of the success of action taken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiatives in this area will take some time to be reflected in feedback. • Two pilot placements undertaken in the “Inter-professional Learning Initiative”, and evaluation carried out for the project advisory team. Positive responses from students and staff involved. Planning for continuation of placements is still to be determined. Such initiatives are high in resources and student time and there are equity of opportunity issues.

Recommendation 2	The Review Team recommends that the Faculty consider ways of improving communication of the Teaching and Learning Plan to all students
Action taken by the Faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • T&L Plan was distributed to all members of the Teaching and Learning Committee (TLC) including the student representative in March 2003. All members were advised to communicate the plan to representative groups. • Advice was sought from the Student Representative on the TLC in December 2002, as to best way to communicate T&L Plan to students. He suggested the use of focus groups. • The initial phase of the TIF Project 2003-2004 (Appendix C.3) involves focus groups of students. These students have been invited by the Student Guild and the first group will meet mid September. The Project Team will communicate the T&L Plan to these students and demonstrate how the project they are contributing to forms an important part of the Plan. • The TLC suggested asking the Student Guild to include the T&L plan in their student publication <i>Corpus Callosum</i>. The relevant Guild person considered that the material had little intrinsic interest to students. • The T&L plan is on the Faculty web site. • Student representatives on School Boards and committees will hear specific reference to T&L plans and will be asked to pass on relevant information. • Individual academics identify issues in lectures that apply to the T&L plan and the wider university. Generic attributes are regularly raised and built into the UOS guide. Anecdotally there is little student interest as they see it as housekeeping not core content. • All schools have an UG Policy Handbook which is distributed to all students. This contains all relevant information regarding the Faculty, school and Academic Board (AB) policies and guidelines. In future a reference will be made to the Faculty T&L plan being on the web. • Policies are discussed in the Year 1 orientation, which is scheduled in O week and in the first 6 weeks of semester 1. • Increasingly UOS outlines use a template that includes references to where issues of generic attributes and T&L aims are addressed
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are moving to the provision of Policy documents etc on the Web rather than in hard copy as students often cannot find their hardcopy soon after it has been provided. Students are increasingly web oriented and equity of access issues are less with improved on-campus IT facilities. This will make on-line links to other policy sources and plans more relevant.
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student representative on the TLC will be asked at the November meeting if the action taken by the Faculty has been successful. • At later TIF focus groups students will be asked about their T&L awareness.

Recommendation 3	The Review Team recommends that the Faculty consider oversighting each School's completion of a mapping exercise of assignment submission dates with the aim of ensuring that students are not overloaded
Action taken by the Faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty was somewhat surprised at part of this recommendation as there has been a long standing process for the consideration of assessment spread at assessment program meetings (APM) as per Faculty policy (Faculty of Health Sciences Course Assessment Manual, Pages 2 and 3). It is felt that students are probably largely ignorant of this process. • Each school holds APMs each semester at which the appropriateness of assessments and their timing are considered. A liaison lecturer from BIOS and BACHS is appointed for each school where relevant, so that timings for non-home school assessments are included. • CDU assessments are scheduled in a Faculty-wide meeting and are sent to all Faculty staff for consideration in school APMs. • Students are given an outline of assessments and due dates (as per Faculty policy). • The TLC with advice from DMAC, constructed a form to be used to ensure that the process described in the Course Assessment Manual has been carried out. A question specifically asking whether input from students had been considered in the APM, was included. This form is to be completed following the School's APM and sent to the TLC for over sighting. • Workload has consistently been the subject of comment in student feedback and the Faculty has previously produced guidelines in terms of the quantum of assessment per credit point that all schools should use as part of APM considerations. • Student comments in CEQ and SCEQ about workload, can also be taken to relate to the total curriculum content to be covered by students, not just the amount of assessment. This is difficult in the context of an exploding knowledge base in all disciplines. Schools carrying out course reviews are looking at curricula in terms of 'total student effort' not just contact hours, especially as the use of independent learning components increases.
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring by UGSC of all curriculum revisions for UG programs to ensure that workload and assessment is optimised for the efficient achievement of course objectives.
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback from AVS, BACHS and OLS states that students appear informed and happy with the process. They use the APM meetings to raise issues about assessment dates and workload. • Appears the issue is more one of student awareness and may occur more in schools where the students rarely attend APMs. • Response to changes will take time to feed through to SCEQ and CEQ.

Recommendation 4	The Review Team recommends that the Faculty consider developing a more consistent policy on feedback and communicate to students what is meant by feedback
Action taken by the Faculty	<p>Feedback from schools and the known use of feedback in the Faculty was considered by the TLC. It was decided that the major problems appeared to be a lack of awareness amongst students of what constituted feedback and the wide range of mechanisms used across the Faculty. Some staff comment was made about how little use many students made of the feedback provided.</p> <p>The Faculty does not wish to stifle the innovative provision of feedback given by many staff, but does wish to establish a baseline minimum standard, plus educate students in the meaning of feedback and their responsibility to use it.</p> <p>A successful application was made for a TIF Grant (\$80K) for 2003-2004 to research, consider and implement best practice use of grade descriptors in the FHS. This will facilitate the development of a more consistent policy on feedback. The grant application, budget and timeline are contained in Appendix C.3. The project officer has been employed, the literature search and initial student focus groups carried out.</p> <p>The following selected responses are indicative of school initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AVS has responded to this issue by identifying feedback when it occurs (students are now identifying that feedback is happening and is good). The level of feedback has not actually changed – the definition of feedback has. Students identify feedback to be written and individual. Other forms of staff provided feedback are often not recognised. • CSD students are advised in their Clinic Handbooks about the developmental model of supervision and feedback that clinical educators (Ces) are trained to use. CEs are encouraged to describe this model explicitly to students so they understand the process. • OLS students receive feedback in several forms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • directly written on assignments • summary feedback page to year via assignment insert • verbal/individual feedback as requested.
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	<p>Some schools have indicated that they will progressively modify their standard unit of study guides to include sections related to the ways feedback is delivered in each unit of study.</p> <p>The TIF Project is on-going until June 2004 and will require staged action as described.</p>
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AVS indicates that USE reports are now rating feedback to be good. • It is too early to comment on the TIF outcomes. They will be evaluated at the end of 2004.

Recommendation 5	The Review Team recommends that the Faculty consider prioritising the usefulness of WebCT either as a pedagogical tool to support a unit of study, or for the provision of delivery of a unit of study
Action taken by the Faculty	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WebCT use is in widespread across the Faculty and increasing as staff skills improve. • Feedback via WebCT is being used more frequently by members of staff. • Development and trial in several schools of WebCT as a support to clinical education, especially during fieldwork when students are off campus. • WebCT training programs and development workshops have been held regularly on campus as coordinated by the Faculty Education Connections director, Dr Mary Jane Mahony. • Incorporated into the TIF Project 2003-2004 (Appendix C.3), is a focus on the use of computer-supported strategies ie WebCT as an on-line learning support in terms of providing feedback. This focus will include both implementation in teaching programs and a grade descriptors development feedback loop. <p>The following selected comments are indicative of those received from schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSD has proposed 2 new PG coursework programs which will be WebCT based • Most BIOS units use WebCT • OLS runs several graduate and undergraduate units of study via WebCT eg. <i>Politics and power in the workplace.</i> • OLS is trialing the use of WebCT within the Master of Occupational Therapy (MOT) problem based cases this semester. This will be evaluated. It is also being used in the undergraduate subject, Professional Practice 2.
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most schools have staged plans to convert existing UOS to utilise WebCT as staff time and resources permit. • CSD reported that Scholarship Index money would be used to support lecturers to move their UOS on-line.
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The progressive implementation of WebCT is occurring across the Faculty with academic units such as BIOS in the lead. • USE data will be monitored for student comment concerning WebCT • Presentations to teaching seminars and discussion within Clinical Education Committee. Overall, positive response to use of WebCT for clinical education, evaluation ongoing.

Recommendation 6	The Review Team recommends that the Faculty consider ways in which student nominations for excellence in teaching awards can be introduced
Action taken by the Faculty	<p>A/Dean T&L:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty TLC fully supports this recommendation, but was concerned to establish a nomination process that would be simple and easy, thus encouraging students to participate. It was felt for instance that requiring any extensive written submission would get little response. The TLC decided to consult across the University to see what is being done elsewhere. • Consultation with Professor Michael Jackson and Dr Michael Paton from the Faculty of Economics and Business identified what they had found to be a successful process for a Student nominated Excellence in Teaching Award. • A proposal was put before the August 2003 Meeting of the FHS TLC. • Dean approved funding for a student nominated prize – August 2003. • Following further discussion by TLC, the proposal was referred to the Excellence in Teaching sub-committee. A subsequent report back has suggested that the process of student nominations needed careful planning and effective promotion to the student body, so the first award will occur in 2004.
Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation to be further discussed by the Excellence in Teaching Sub-Committee and a report tabled at the September TLC Meeting. • Expect to make the first award in 2004. • Publicity of this award mechanism will be given in 2004 with the view to get widespread participation. • Comments from HOSs indicate some schools are considering internal awards
Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools are supportive of the idea. • Student Guild are supportive and we can use the student newspaper for publicity. • Evaluation will be made in 2004 of the response gained.

<p>Recommendation 7</p>	<p>The Review Team recommends that the Faculty consider ways of improving the postgraduate research student experience, particularly in relation to developing a Faculty wide induction program, cross school connections, research seminars, and involvement in the business of the Faculty</p>
<p>Action taken by the Faculty</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Faculty now has an ‘all postgraduate student email list’ operating. This provides an efficient method to alert students to relevant information (e.g. scholarships, lectures by Visiting Professors etc.). This email list will help FHS address one of the problems identified in the 2002 SREQ data (Appendix A.5), by providing a mechanism to invite students to be part of the normal scholarly activities of the campus. • The Faculty has been running an Induction Evening for PG students for several years and a high proportion of commencing HDR and coursework students attend. The 2003 program included a welcome from the Dean and presentations from the University DoGS, SUPRA, FHS library and FHS staff PG students with advice and experiences. • Small schools have identified HDR critical mass as an issue and there are now good initiatives being taken to group together and share events with larger units. Students do tend, however, to want to identify with their discipline group. • CSD is being most proactive in this area and is working with AVS, who have small numbers of PG students, to share resources • Most Schools now run mid-year mini conferences or presentation sessions for their HDR students and invite staff and students from other disciplines to attend. The attendance in 2003 has been good. • HScD students have a mandatory progress presentation seminar. • CSD PG students obtained Supra support to run a ‘get-together’ session prior to one of the School’s Twilight Seminars. Students met with HOS and PG coordinator to raise issues and concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priorities included more student contact across the Faculty and research space on campus. • organise regular student study days on-campus and invited all research students. • organised Hypotheticals as a cross-Faculty seminar to encourage interaction between students from all Schools. • Moved research seminars to the evenings to encourage students to attend more regularly. • Encourage staff to do group supervision meetings so students can interact with each other as well as the supervisor. <p>Comments of the A/Dean Grad. Research: <i>Improving experience:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have commenced working with Ms Tai Paseta of the ITL on strategies to improve student experience. This will be driven by information from the original Academic Board Review, 2002 SREQ data and two focus groups with FHS HDR students. We have completed the first focus group and produced a report and are in the middle of data collection for the final focus group. The plan is that the ITL will then produce a series of recommendations for the Faculty, based upon all this information. We expect that this will occur within the next month or so. • I have contacted Paul Binns from the ITL to obtain SREQ data for each School. This arrived last month and at the last GSC meeting we agreed that each School would inspect their SREQ data and prepare a list of areas that are clearly different to the University result. Schools would then need to develop a plan for how they would investigate/address the issues and this plan would be submitted to the September GSC meeting. A report of the actions taken and outcomes needs to be

	<p>submitted to the GSC at the March 2004 GSC meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have formed policy to assist to improve student experience. <p><i>FHS award for excellence in HDR supervision</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First award this year to A/Prof Kenny <p><i>FHS guidelines for off-campus students</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires schools to provide evidence that appropriate arrangements have been made for supervision, infrastructure, skill development and intellectual climate prior to enrolment. <p><i>FHS guidelines on supervisor qualifications</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides minimum academic qualifications for supervisors. <p><i>FHS resource statement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a mechanism for schools to fully inform students of the facilities that will be provided to them prior to commencing candidature. <p><i>FHS 500 word report</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of the proposal is to encourage pre-enrolment planning/preparation by the student, supervisor and school that will assist prompt commencement of research work and timely completion of the candidature. <p><i>Induction programs:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DOGS has developed a University-based induction program, this is supplemented by the induction day run by the Faculty and those run by Schools and HScD. The induction programs run by Schools and HScD run over the semester and are more akin to coursework. As well the FHS library runs workshops in both semesters on topics such as general database searching, use of Endnote, use of specialist databases. <p><i>Research seminars:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These are now timetabled regularly by Schools. The most recent two were the HScD colloquium 8/08/03 and the BACHS PG research symposium (20/06/03), ESS and PT will hold days later this semester. These are open to all FHS staff and students. <p><i>Cross-school connections:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In June Natalie Munro, a CSD HDR student, organised an FHS HDR student social, which will be repeated in November. The Faculty is supporting this initiative by providing a room free of charge whereas the Student Guild wanted to charge the students \$400. <p><i>Involvement in the business of the FHS:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We now have an HDR student rep on GSC and FRC.
<p>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</p>	<p>A/Dean Graduate Research:</p> <p><i>College level:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Faculty is part of College efforts to improve research supervision. The Associate Dean (GR) chairs the College Planning Committee for research students, participates in the Board of Post graduate Studies in Medicine, Dentistry, and Pharmacy, and aims to migrate 'best practice' from the Board to the Faculty. We are supporting College-led policies, procedures and oversight of postgraduate research students and supervisors, with the operational management devolved to

	<p>faculties and school. We are keen for all faculties in the College to have appropriate information technologies to support research training, eg, easy access to accurate postgraduate research student data, high-quality web site for prospective students.</p> <p><i>Induction programs:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collating a list of formal and non-formal units offered in FHS for dissemination to HDR students. The plan is to allow the students flexibility to select units that suit their needs. Again this is more like coursework than an induction program. <p>Schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feedback after the first BIOS conference from students and staff was very positive. • The idea of introducing a Faculty-wide seminar/workshop series has been taken by BIOS to the FRC. • CSD are currently developing a School PG student manual. • Most schools plan to ask more specific questions about these issues in their HDR progress interviews. • OLS will be implementing compulsory student presentations of their research from semester 1, 2004. This will involve students, clinicians and research supervisors. Students will be required to present at the beginning and then towards the end of their candidature (as a minimum).
<p>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</p>	<p>A/Dean Grad. Research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Faculty Induction evening was highly praised by students, DOGS and the SUPRA president. • The HDR research seminars that have been run this year have been well attended and received by students and staff. • The feedback we have received from the HDR student representative is that the first FHS student social was an enormous success. • It is too early to establish if things have improved in students perceptions of the research experience because there is a long lag time on these sorts of things. If things moved quickly it would just be noise. You change policy, then hopefully attitudes and then practices of HOD, PG coordinators and supervisors and then things should improve for the students. We hopefully will see this reflected in the students' perceptions in the SREQ. I think that if these initiatives are to have an effect it will be first seen in the 2003 SREQ data, but more likely the 2004 data. • Staff have informally stated that they have found some of the policy initiatives helpful with their students. Eg one staff member stated that she found the resource statement helpful with a new applicant because they could see all the facilities the School provides and was appreciative of this. Both parties also valued the opportunity to clarify what resources the student was expected to supply and what resources the School would supply.

<p>Recommendation 8</p>	<p>The Review Team recommends that the Faculty consider ways in which the physical and resource support for PhD students could be improved, particularly in relation to access to and sharing of computers. The Faculty should also consider ways in which to ensure that the increasing number of full-time PhD students have more privacy</p>
<p>Action taken by the Faculty</p>	<p>Some years ago the Faculty erected a purpose designed research building for cross faculty use. This was not well utilized as staff and students expressed a preference to work in the same general location as their peers and supervisor(s). The Faculty established a space review with the primary aim of co-locating teachers, researchers, students and research facilities.</p> <p>As a result, ESS who had major research infrastructure in the research building, moved in as a whole. CSD was relocated to better relate to their clinic and HIM and the National Centre for Classification in Health (NCCCH) also moved to new areas. Residual free space was allocated to best meet the needs of on campus HDR students. It should be noted that many FHS HDR students are part time, working and by preference use infrastructure in their workplace.</p> <p>Schools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BACHS has acquired office space for PG students and now have two major spaces available. All research students now have access to a computer and a place to sit. Full-time students have a desk and their own allocated computer. • Most BIOS research students have been relocated to a new room with better privacy and facilities. This area accommodates 15 students, each student has a computer, some are in private cubicles, others share rooms with 2-3 other students. • CSD has purchased filing cabinets and lockers for PG students. • CSD gives priority to employment of PG students as CEs- this gives them an office and computer. • Most schools are moving to the use of a resource statement as described in the previous recommendation discussion. <p>A/Dean Graduate Research.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The GSC has no budget with which to dispense funds and has no control over Faculty or School infrastructure. Nevertheless the GSC has raised this issue with the Dean and Heads of School at a DMAC forum. As well the GSC has developed policy to require Schools to explicitly describe the facilities that will be provided to a HDR student: <p><i>FHS guidelines for off-campus students</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires schools to provide evidence that appropriate arrangements have been made for supervision, infrastructure, skill development and intellectual climate prior to enrolment <p><i>FHS resource statement</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a mechanism for schools to fully inform students of the facilities that will be provided to them prior to commencing candidature.

<p>Further action planned but not yet implemented (if appropriate)</p>	<p>A/Dean Grad. Research.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The DOGS has signaled that he has obtained funding from the VC for HDR student infrastructure. Faculties will be expected to match central funds. When this scheme is announced we will work closely with Schools to ensure that maximum benefits accrue to the Faculty.• Schools have identified their limited ability to fund the required the infrastructure needs of their HDR students. Proposals have been put to Faculty for consideration of a shared approach.
<p>Faculty's evaluation of the success of action taken</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Schools that have relocated students cite very positive feedback.• More results will be available after the next round of student progress interviews and the next SREQ. <p>A/Dean Grad. Research.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• One staff member stated that she found the resource statement helpful with a new applicant because they could see all the facilities the School provides and was appreciative of this. Both parties also valued the opportunity to clarify what resources the student was expected to supply and what resources the School would supply.